

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This Reply encompasses a bona fide attempt to overcome the rejections raised by the Examiner in the November 29, 2011 Office Action, and to place the present application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 14, 17, 19-24, 27, 30-34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nesamoney et al. (US 6,044,374). The rejection is traversed.

To expedite prosecution and without conceding to the Examiner's positions, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite "the first privilege assigned to the first user allows the first user to share a first object from the first site with the second site, the second privilege assigned to the second user allows the second user to view the duplicate of the reference to the object; performing a first operation to store a duplicate of the reference to the object in the second repository associated with or available to the second site on the portal framework based on the first privilege." For at least the following reasons, the cited art fails to disclose, suggest or teach the above-mentioned limitations of the independent claims.

Embodiments disclosed by Applicant enable an object to be directly or indirectly shared between a first repository and a second repository. A repository framework may be implemented to perform a sharing type of administration. Such a sharing type of administration makes an object available for reuse by a site, either directly or indirectly, by storing duplicates of a reference to the object in one or more repositories. In one embodiment, to share an object, a user of a first site may store a duplicate of a reference to an object at a repository of a second site based on a privilege (e.g., a share type privilege). See e.g., '513 Application, p. 43. For example, a user of site A can share objects to site B based on "a can share to site B" permission for site A. See e.g., '513 Application, p. 43. Sharing to site B can be achieved by storing a duplicate of a reference to an object from the site A repository in the repository of site B based on the "can share to site B" privilege. See e.g., '513 Application, p. 42. However, the users of site A may be precluded from viewing the repository of site B. See e.g., '513 Application, p. 43. A user at the second site (e.g., site B) may see the object based on a privilege at the second site that allows the user of the second site access the site B repository.

Thus, for example, an administrator of a first site may create an object (say a web site menu) and based on the administrator privileges set for the first site may store a duplicate of a reference to the object in a repository for a second site according to a “can share to site” privilege. A user at the second site (say an administrator of the second site) may now see the object of the first site based on a privilege assigned to that user at the second site. Consequently, the user of the second site can provide, for example, the menu as part of the second site. Therefore, the ability to share objects from a first site is based on privileges defined for the first site and the ability to see the duplicate references of objects at the second site is based on privileges defined at the second site for users (e.g., administrators) of the second site.

Nesamoney, on the other hand, provides a system of shared folders in a global data repository (“GDR”) that may include objects referenced in folders of linked repositories. The ability to share objects and view the shared objects is based on the privileges assigned to users for accessing folders in the shared repository. In particular, users are assigned privileges to read/write folders at a global data repository (“GDR”) thus enabling users to update what is shared and what is viewed in various linked repositories. See Col. 6, ll. 48-58. This ability of a user to read/write to a shared GBR is set as a privilege for the user account on the GBR not a privilege set for some other site. See Nesamoney, Col. 6, ll. 45-51. Therefore, the access privilege that allows an object to be shared to the GBR is set at the GBR and is not a privilege “[assigned] . . . at the first site to a first user of the first site to allow the first user to share a first object from the first collection of objects with [a second site].”

Furthermore, when an object shared is to the GBR, the object itself is placed in the GBR, not a duplicate of a reference to the object. See Nesamoney, Col. 7, ll. 26-29. Thus, the operation of sharing an object in the GBR is not “a first operation to store a duplicate of the reference to the object in the second repository associated with or available to the second site on the portal framework based on the first privilege.”

References to objects in the GDR may be created in linked repositories for multiple data marts (e.g., a first linked repository for a first data mart and a second linked repository for a second data mart may contain references to the object in the GBR). See Nesamoney, Fig. 2. However, there is no teaching that an operation to store a reference to the object in the second linked repository is based on a privilege assigned at the first data mart to the user of the first data mart rather than, as suggested by Nesamoney, the privilege assigned at the GBR to a user of the second data mart to access a shared folder of the GBR containing the object. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully submits that the storage of references to an object of the GBR to a second linked repositories is not “performing a first operation to store a duplicate of the reference to the object in the second repository associated with or available to the second site on the portal framework based on the first privilege [assigned to a user of a first site for the first site].”

Furthermore, as the privileges to read/write objects in Nesamoney are all defined for user accounts on the GBR, Nesamoney does not disclose “assigning a first privilege to a first user of the first site to allow the first user to share a first object from the first collection of objects with another site” in combination with “assigning a second privilege at the second site to a second user, wherein the second privilege allows the second user to access objects in the second repository, wherein the first privilege assigned to the first user allows the first user to share a first object from the first site with the second site, the second privilege assigned to the second user allows the second user to view the duplicate of the reference to the object; performing a first operation to store a duplicate of the reference to the object in the second repository associated with or available to the second site on the portal framework based on the first privilege” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the cited art does not disclose each and every limitation as recited in amended claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore allowable. The other independent claims are allowable at least for somewhat similar limitations as claim 1, and on their own merits. The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable independent claim. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejections, and allowance of each of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 38, 39 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nesamoney et al. in view of Dysart et al (US 5,899,996).

Applicant respectfully submits that Dysart does not make up for the noted deficiencies in Nesamoney of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the cited art does not disclose each and every limitation as recited in amendment claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore allowable. The other independent claims are allowable at least for somewhat similar limitations as claim 1, and on their own merits, and the dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable independent claim. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejections, and allowance of each of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of each pending claim. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

**SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP**  
Attorneys for Applicant

John L. Adair  
Reg. No. 48,828

Date: February, 29 2012

1301 W. 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 408  
Austin, Texas 78705  
Tel. (512) 637-9220  
Fax. (512) 371-9088